DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 454 CS 505 198

AUTHOR Farrar, Mary Thomas
TITLE Three Models of Discussion: A Sociolinguistic Analysis Examining Relationships among Models of Discussion and Verbal Interactional Patterns. Third Draft.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 77p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; *Discussion (Teaching Technique); Group Discussion; Interaction; *Interaction Process Analysis; Language Usage; *Models; Questioning Techniques; Secondary Education; *Sociolinguistics; Speech Communication; *Teacher Student Relationship; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

In a sociolinguistic study of five transcripts of high school discussions, two analyses were conducted. The first was a detailed qualitative analysis of the data, which combined paralinguistic features with three perspectives: a speech act analysis, a conversation analysis, and an interaction analysis. In the second, more quantitative analysis, the relative frequencies of various verbal interactional patterns, the use of topic control, and other conversational management factors were tabulated and compared. The results of these two micro-analyses revealed three models of discussion: discussion as course-covering, discussion as integrating, and discussion as expressing. Each model was then examined and compared with the others in four respects. Although no necessary and exclusive one-to-one match between verbal interactional pattern and model of discussion was explicated, a strong relationship between models of discussion and certain kinds of verbal interaction was demonstrated. The results suggest that (1) the question/answer format is associated with the subject-matter oriented course-covering model; (2) lack of strong topic control plus a focus on expression of feelings, observations, and opinions is associated with the student centered expressing model; and (3) combinations of explicit positive evaluation moves and of integrative questions and statements are associated with the integrating model. (The major portion of the paper is devoted to the analyses of the transcripts and interactions.) (EL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED267454

THIRD DRAFT

August, 1985.

Three Models of Discussion: A Sociolinguistic Analysis Examining Relationships among Models of Discussion and Verbal Interactional Patterns

by

Mary Thomas Farrar

Private Scholar

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

R. R. #1, Inverary, Ontario, Canada, K0H 1X0

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary Thomas Farrar
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Paper presented as part of a Multidisciplinary Symposium on Classroom Discussion organized by J. T. Dillon for The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April, 1985.

CS 505198

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This paper is one of a group that constitute a multidisciplinary international symposium. In April of 1985, at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, a number of researchers from different disciplines and different countries came together to share their analyses of a common set of 5 transcripts. The transcripts were of 5 high school discussions. For further details concerning these transcripts and the analyses of the other contributors to the symposium, please contact J. T. Dillon of the School of Education at the University of California, Riverside.

Figure 1

Three Models of Discussion

Model of Discussion	Discussion as Course-Covering	Discussion as Integrating		Discussion as Expressing
Centeredness	Subject-Centered	Integration of Subject Centred and Student Centred		Student-Centered
Focus	Explicating Facts and Explanations	(Predominately Subject-Centered) Integrating Facts and Explanations with Reflection based on Theory and Experience	(Predominately Student-Centred) Integrating Expressions of Feelings, Opinions and Observations into some Structural Framework.	Expressing
Topic Control	Tight	Intermediate		Loose

Figure 1 (Continued)

Predominant Verbal Interactional Patterns	-teacher controlled questioning sequences	-statement/comment patterns -long teacher turns including positive evaluation moves, integrating statements and/or questions and possibly suggestions re future talk			-non-directive reflective statements -student/student exchanges	
Characteristics	-searching for text-based facts and explanations	-deliberative thinking including back-tracking, reviewing, revising, comparing, contrasting -critical reflection -unresponsiveness -using evidence and argument to support positions -articulating			-expressing feelings, opinions and observations -making unexamined generalizations -ideosyncratic sallies	
Roby Coding of 5 lesson types	Recitation	Problematic		Dialectic	Permissive Discussion	Bull Session
Coding of the 5 Analyzed Lessons	Recitation (HK)	Partial Problematic (PR)		Dialect (WB)	Permissive Discussion (SN)	Bull Session (MK)

iii

Over the past twenty years, sociolinguistic analysis of classroom discourse has become an increasingly respected method for gaining insight into clasroom life. The field is varied: approaches have been developed from a number of disciplines including philosophy, linguistics, sociology, psycholinguistics and anthropology. Bellack et al's (1966) seminal work was based on a philosophical model of language (Wittgenstein, 1968). Sinclair & Coulthard's (1975) rank ordered system combined Bellack et al's (1966) classification with Halliday's (1961) systemic grammar. Since 1975, sociolinguistic research has taken from fields as diverse as speech act philosophy (e.g., Austin, 1962; Searle 1969; 1975;), conversation analysis (e.g., Sacks, 1967), anthropology (e.g., Frake, 1974; Hymes, 1972) and sociology (e.g., Goffman, 1959) and combined ideas from these fields with ethnographic techniques to develop some understanding of the effects of social contexts on the verbal interactions of the classroom. The basic purpose of sociolinguistic studies has been to show how reality is constructed through social interactions. Some of the more well-known studies are Griffin & Humphrey's (1978) work, Mehan's (1979) "Learning Lessons", the N.I.E. studies synthesized in Green's (1982) paper and the papers included in Ervin-Tripp & Mitchell-Kernan's (1977) book "Child Discourse", Green & Wallat's (1981) book "Ethnography and language in educational settings" and Wilkinson's (1982) book "Communicating in the Classroom".

In this sociolinguistic study of the Dillon transcripts, two analyses were conducted. The first was a very detailed qualitative analysis of the data that combined examination of paralinguistic

features with three perspectives: A speech act analysis served to identify certain linguistic features of a given utterance as well as offer some account of speaker intention. A conversation analysis examined the position of the utterance in the discourse, its relation to prior and subsequent turns at talk and the manner in which an utterance was understood by the hearer. The third form of analysis, termed the interactional analysis, combined researcher conceptions with the results from the two earlier methods in an effort to interpret the transcripts more intelligibly and usefully. (For further elaboration of the underlying assumptions, strengths and limitations of each of these approaches and the rationale for combining them, see Farrar, 1981; 1984). The second was a more quantitative analysis. Here, the relative frequencies of various verbal interactional patterns, the use of topic control and other conversational management factors were tabulated and compared (See Figure 1). The results of these two kinds of micro-analysis revealed three distinct models of discussion: discussion as course-covering, discussion as integrating and discussion as expressing. Each model was then examined and compared with the others in four respects: 1. centeredness (whether the talk was subject-centered or student-centered), 2. topic control (whether the control was tight, intermediate or loose), 3. predominant use of certain verbal interactional patterns, and 4. characteristics (whether the talk was about text-based facts and explanations or feelings and opinions; whether it included features such as deliberative thinking, backtracking etc.). Each lesson was then coded both ideally according to Roby's (1985) formulations and actually according to how micro-analysis of the data suggested. It was concluded that it is useful to conceptualize discussion in three models. The three models

provide a framework for examining and differentiating among alternate modes of classroom interaction. Although no tight one-to-one match between each model and one specific verbal interactional pattern was discovered, there did seem to be a strong connection between each model and the predominant use of a small range of verbal interactional forms.

Following a description of the transcript conventions used, each transcript is examined in turn. First a sample qualitative analysis is presented. This is followed in each case by the quantitative analysis. Finally, in the summary, the analyses are compared and the implications for education discussed.

Transcript Conventions

The transcript segments analyzed were coded originally by J.T. Dillon for the purpose of comparing relative frequency of teacher questions and teacher statements, percentages of higher and lower cognitive utterances and gender differences in contribution frequency. Because the data were collected and numbered for these purposes, certain coding and transcription difficulties became apparent when a qualitative analysis of the same material was to be conducted. First, teacher turns coded as 1a, 2a etc. were identified simply as questions or statements. This terminology was retained though more specific terminology is more revealing. In 1975, for example, Sinclair and Coulthard distinguished between interrogatives (identified by grammatical features such as reversed word order or the inclusion of "wh" words, questions (identified situationally e.g., rhetorical questions) and elicitations (those questions that performed the discourse function of requesting a response from someone else). These terms, however, seemed unnecessarily technical for the present project

first because the simpler vocabulary was in keeping with that of the other researchers on the project and second, because the simpler terms, though more general in nature were sufficient to convey the nature of the utterance. In cases where the teacher utterance was a rhetorical question it was identified as such. Similarly, when the teacher utterance constituted a reply to a student question rather than being either a question or a statement, it was identified as such. In the original transcription, teacher nominations were not identified as teacher questions. Ts were placed in the margin to identify these utterances. Similarly, Ss in the margin were used to identify student utterances that somehow escaped coding. Overlaps are marked by square brackets. A slash indicates a pause of less than a 1/2 second as timed with a stop watch while dots indicate a pause of a 1/2 second. Periods have been eliminated for purposes of clarity. Rising and falling intonation have been marked with rising and falling arrows respectively and stressed words have been underlined.

HK (The Recitation Lesson)

General Description of the Lesson

This is a recitation lesson dominated and controlled by the teacher question. According to Good (1983), a recitation lesson is a "traditional learning exercise and teaching procedure in which students repeat orally or explain material learned by individual study or previously presented by the teacher and in response to questions raised by the teacher." To use Roby's (1985) terminology, it is a "Quiz Show". Students are being asked to recall previously studied facts and state explanations. The style is demanding and probing, not praising

or supportive. The teacher uses questions to cover course content - to introduce topics and to request clarification. The subject matter is cognitive rather than affective. Previously studied facts and explanations for those facts are sought. For this teacher, discussion seems to be the joint achievement by student and teacher (through teacher questions and student responses) of text-relevant facts and explanations. In short, the model evident here is discussion as course-covering.

Paralinguistic Cues.

The teacher's voice is high-pitched. The pace is fast. (There are 64 exchanges in the 10 minute segment.) Sometimes the teacher questions contain pauses and hesitations, at other times not. Pragmatic particles like "you know" do not occur commonly. There are variations in intonation and stress. The teacher's voice is not monotonous. The tone seems agitated, aggressive and business-like for the most part though there is a curious tone change when the teacher is responding to student questions. Here the voice is lower-pitched and the tone seems quieter and more intimate.

Qualitative Analysis of Transcript HK (The Recitation Lesson)

The first four exchanges were chosen for the sample analysis as they seemed to typify this lesson. They are as follows:

1a: What . ah . I want to go to another question about his/military capabilities What was it/that made him/militarily successful? What was it about his strategy/that enabled him to be successful? ..↓

Howard ↑

1b: He didn't fight straight out like the British/↓

S: No he didn't

1b: He fought behind/brick walls, trees and stuff like that

2a: Did you read/anywhere in the book/where his army ... was destroyed? ↓

2b: No

3a: That his army/was destroyed ↓

S No (--?--)

3a: Did you see that anywhere?

S: Uh Uh (--?--)

3a: That Washington's army was destroyed? ↑

3b: Not completely ↓

4a: Not completely?

S: (--?--)

4a: Tony? ↑

4b: They were outsmarted, but not destroyed ↓

The First Exchange.

Speech Act Analysis

In the first exchange, the teacher's first move (in #1a) is a statement identifying the teacher's intention to investigate a new topic. The two succeeding moves within the teacher's first turn are questions; they appear to be asking for student responses. These are then followed by a nomination which calls upon one student to respond. The student provides an apt response, stating Washington's strategy.

Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis reveals that no space was provided for a response following either the initial statement or the first question. Consequently, both of these moves appear to serve as means of introducing the topic rather than actually asking a question intended to receive a response. In contrast, the third question is followed by a pause of one second indicating that a response is being sought. This indication that the next turn at talk is to be taken by a student is further punctuated by the nomination.

Interactional Analysis

Why might the teacher might use such a strategy? It would seem reasonable to suggest that through using a four move turn such as the

above, the teacher allows the students time to reflect on the new topic at the same time as he avoids embarrassing silences and maintains control of the talk.

Exchanges #2, #3 and #4.

Speech Act Analysis

In the second exchange, the teacher asks a yes/no question. Based on speech act theory, an acceptable response to this presumably direct "Did you read anywhere..?" question should be "yes" or "no". A student responds "no". In the third exchange, the teacher rephrases the question of exchange #2. Again, some students respond with "no" and "uh-uh". Then a third student replies "not completely". The teacher question in exchange #4 repeats the student response "not completely". Rising intonation signals its function as a question as does the subsequent nomination "Tony". This question receives an acceptable response. Speech act analysis is revealing here as a means of explaining why the responses of "no" and uh-uh" weren't accepted when, presumably, they should have been. By looking at the accepted response of "not completely", one can figure out retrospectively, that the teacher's use of the yes/no question in exchange #2 was indirect and conventional much in the way that one might ask "Can you pass the salt?" expecting not a "yes" or a "no" but an action. Here, the teacher seems to have been asking the explicit ("Did you read anywhere---?) yes/no question as a conventional means of implying the implicit question "What happened to the army when it fought?" But the students answer the explicit question instead.

Conversation Analysis

Typically, in much ordinary conversation, a yes/no question is asked as a pre-sequence as in A1/A2 in the following:

A1: Are you busy tonight?

A2: No.

B1: Would you like to go out?

B2: Sure.

In the lesson example, following the presequence question "Did you read anywhere---?", the next question the teacher might have asked if a response of "not completely" had not been forthcoming (#3b) might have been "If his army wasn't destroyed, what happened when it fought?"

Because the pattern of presequence followed by main question is so common, it has become an accepted convention to merely ask a presequence yes/no question, thereby implying the subsequent question. Some of the students may not have recognized this as evidenced by their "no" responses. Or, they may have recognized it but chosen to answer the explicit question for another reason. (e.g., The implied question may have been too difficult to figure out and/or to answer.) The respondent in #3b, however, has understood that another question was implied as indicated by his response of more than a simple "yes" or "no".

In exchange #4, the teacher repeats the student's prior acceptable response with questioning intonation and then nominates Tony. In this way, the response becomes the subsequent teacher question. The teacher's repetition of "not completely" with rising intonation and the subsequent nomination act as a signal for Tony to elaborate on the

meaning of the prior eliptical (incomplete) response and to answer more fully the previous implied question.

Interactional Analysis

Why would the teacher use the ambiguous "Did you read anywhere---?" form? It would seem reasonable to suggest here that this ambiguous indirect form is conventionally polite or face-saving. Students are ostensibly being offered the option of answering either the easier explicit yes/no question or the more difficult implicit question. But here instead of really being given such an option, the conventional form is being used with the expectation that students will respond to the implicit question just as one is expected to pass the salt in the example discussed above. Because of the inherent ambiguity in the question form, however, some confusion seems to have resulted. Some students answer the explicit question and the answers are not accepted. Through this technique then, the teacher gives the appearance of being polite and of offering face-saving options while simultaneously demanding more difficult responses.

Another issue is why the teacher might have repeated the student response (#3b) in exchange #4? A number of reasons seem acceptable. First, it saves time if the teacher does not have to explicate the implied question. Second, it signals the class that the response "not completely" is on the right track. Third, it probes. The response is tacitly positively evaluated in that the teacher's question has moved to new ground while it is also tacitly partially negatively evaluated because it has been deemed insufficient. (c.f. Griffin & Humphrey, 1978). Combined positive and negative evaluation such as this could be read as probing and challenging teaching. If such behaviour

encourages the student to respond more appropriately, then instruction is facilitated. (It should also be noted in passing, however, that in some settings, some students might find such questioning intimidating . If this were true, instruction would not be facilitated.)

Quantitative Analysis of HK (The Recitation Lesson)

Predominant Exchange Patterns

The teacher question dominates. Almost all the exchanges consist of one of the following questioning patterns - question/answer, question,question/answer, question/answer/feedback though sometimes question,nomination/answer, statement,question/answer or a combination of the above are used as in the first exchange where the pattern is question,question,nomination/answer.

Indirect questions (e.g., Did you read anywhere...?) occur in approximately 1/4 (15/64) of the exchanges. This is a conventional device, ostensibly providing students with the face-saving option of having to respond to the explicit question only.

There are a couple of occasions where student questions are directed to the teacher; one is a single question, the other a series of questions and responses.

There is only one occasion where a student comment is based on a prior student comment.

Evaluation

Explicit evaluation is not common. Explicit positive evaluation occurs only 7 times in the 64 exchanges.

The most common evaluation form is combined tacit positive and

tacit negative evaluation as in, for example, clarification requests (where it is suggested that the response was partially correct but not complete). This type of evaluation is in 14 of the 64 exchanges.

Tacit positive evaluation alone (in the form of a prior student response repeated with falling (accepting?) intonation occurs only 4 times.

Topic Control

The teacher keeps tight control of the topic mostly by soliciting information in teacher/student question/answer sequences.

He introduces all the topics and is in charge of all topic shifts with the exception of the two occasions of student questions.

To focus topic, he uses question repeats or prior student responses with questioning intonation (clarification requests), rephrasings and successive questions in one turn.

Typically, a series of exchanges on a topic is followed by a teacher turn that summarizes and consolidates.

The teacher takes a long turn (a) following a series of unsuccessful exchanges and (b) following student questions. These long turns tend to consolidate topic and reestablish teacher control.

In general, it appears that the teacher introduces topics in accordance with a pre-planned agenda. The topics so introduced are not contingent (i.e., precipitated by and incorporating) prior student comments. However, once a topic is underway, questioning tends to be based on prior student comments as students are requested to clarify and give reasons.

Teacher turns are liberally scattered with connectives like "well" and "so" that mark the connection between prior student comment and

subsequent teacher question.

Topic completion is marked by a teacher turn where what has been stated is summarized.

Other Conversational Management Factors

The teacher talks most of the time (59% as coded in the Dillon analysis) and almost all the turns are teacher/student.

He ensures that the class is quiet, that only one person talks at a time.

Student questions and interruptions are rare.

The teacher does not contribute his own personal opinions or feelings or suggest solutions to a problem.

Students are addressed by first name, though formal address ("Miss Edwards") is used on one occasion.

There is no slang, joking or teasing.

There is no backchannel support (e.g., "um hmm").

There is no instance of the teacher talk occurring in the background.

PR (The Partial Problematic Lesson)

General Description of the Lesson

The major focus of this lesson is on explicating a variety of explanatory models although repeating and explaining previously learned material occurs initially. It is difficult to classify because it seems to have two styles - a fact gathering recitation style and a more intimate proping for explanations style. Roby (1985) has classed this as a Problematic Discussion because there are apparently many possible

explanations for the problem being discussed. At the same time, however, this lesson is not problematic because the acceptable possible solutions seem to be predetermined by the teacher's agenda - the course. In the end, two explanatory models are found (as opposed to the simpler explanations sought to describe events in the recitation lesson), but the lesson as a whole is still fairly strongly dominated by teacher question and topic control. In the first part of the lesson segment, the style is demanding and probing, not praising and supportive. In the second half of the lesson segment, however, a different manner becomes evident, one that seems to convey a joint groping on the part of teacher and student for the explanatory models. Here, particularly in the last five exchanges, both teacher and student turns are longer and the tone is more intimate.

In order to accommodate both styles, the lesson might be described as "guided discussion" following Good (1983) : "a method of teaching by which students develop an understanding of the subject matter through discussion of pertinent points related to that subject." This definition is, however, too general to be useful. It seems better to suggest that two verbal interactional styles exist side by side - one, a question/answer style geared to explicate facts, the other more of a statement/comment style geared to eventuate in integrated explanations. The subject matter remains cognitive rather than affective. Once again, the interaction seems to fit a course covering model. There is a very important distinction, however, between course covering here and in the case of HK (The Recitation Lesson). Whereas the course in the recitation lesson consisted of recalled information and relatively simple explanations, here it seems to consist predominantly of attempts to solve problems and integrate explanations that are thought out in

class. In both cases, the teacher seems to have an agenda and part of a course seems to be covered. Therefore, in both cases, discussion can be conceived of as the joint achievement by teacher and student of text-centered facts and explanations though in one case the facts and explanations are actually in the text and in the second case though related, they may not actually be contained in the text. Because of these differences, the lesson has been coded as partial problematic rather than recitation.

Paralinguistic Cues.

The teacher's voice is rather high-pitched. The pace seems fairly hurried (There 28 exchanges in the 10 minute segment). .Generally, there are few pauses and repairs. The phrasing is economical and probing. (Pragmatic particles like "you know" occur in his more intimate style.) Most teacher questions are uttered with the falling intonation characteristic of statements. The voice is expressive with changing intonation and word stress patterns. Key words are stressed. The tone seems aggressive, demanding and business-like and even almost angry sometimes. A sense of urgency is transmitted during the parts of the lesson devoted to recalling facts. There is a marked change in tone and in general verbal style, however, when the teacher and students are working out the explanatory models. Here, the teacher's lower, more intimate, softer tone is accompanied by a number of hesitations, repairs and pragmatic particles.

Qualitative Analysis of Transcript PR (The Partial Problematic Lesson)

The sample analysis here is of exchanges #20-#23.

20a: OK/Come on/find it Mike↓

20b: You'd probably expect to find problems she had at home/you know like mistreatment from her parents

21a: How would/How would that

21b: 'cause ah/that can set up like/insecurity/and she might look for/ah something else that's inside herself to compensate for that/so she developed a new personality/you know↑...

T: OK Ah Darryl↑

21c: like getting back to the childhood thing (---?---) like see who her idols were?/See where the person had her idols ....

22a: OK but how would that/if you found out who her heroes/or her idols were/what would that have to do with splitting off into two personalities? Aaah Terrance↓

22b: Would you/want to try and be like your idol? If/if you you know if they were/if you idolize someone/you will/more or less want to be like them to a certain point/then like ah/ah if she had ah/an auntie that was shot/ and you know/she admired her for the way she was maybe she'd be shot down as long as she's like her auntie She'll go home and see that her mother's ah you know/a nice housewife/She'd want to be like that/And/go for reality and /(---?---) her friends (---?---)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

something like that

23a: We all experience what you just said .. How come .. ah so it .. don't we?

S: Yeah

23a: How come she wound up in such a/such a/a (branch?)?

23b: Well would it have been some kind of/ah restrictions in her background that an/wouldn't allow her to do that/such as her parents not letting her do something/to the point that/she reacted a lot/like ah ...

24a: Did you see the movie?

24b: No

The Five Exchanges

Speech Act Analysis

In exchange #20, the teacher exhorts the students to find out what might have happened in Eve's background to have caused her split personality and then nominates one student, Mike, to respond. Mike responds. In exchange #21, the teacher probes Mike to elaborate his response. Mike responds further. The teacher accepts his response (OK) and then nominates another student Darryl. Darryl also answers

the teacher's question (#21a). Again, the teacher accepts (OK) and probes for further elaboration and then nominates Terrance. Terrance responds. In #23a, the teacher makes a statement commenting on Terrance's response, begins a new question but then interrupts his own question to check for student agreement. Having achieved student agreement, the teacher continues to probe "How come---?" A student responds in #23b. Then, in #24a, the teacher shifts the topic to ask whether the student respondent of #23b had seen the movie. The question receives a negative response.

Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis offers some insight into the mechanics of this probing style. First, the teacher exhorts the students in a clear imperative to "Find it". Then following Mike's attempt in #20b, he begins a probe "How would/how would that". This probe could be seen as simultaneously accepting the prior response (tacit positive evaluation) and asking for more thereby indicating that the prior response was insufficient (tacit negative evaluation). Utterance #21a could also be described, however, as an "evaluation withold" because it indicates that evaluation is being witheld pending the student's explanation. Following the #21b responses, the teacher again can be seen as combining positive and negative evaluation, this time explicit positive and tacit negative evaluation, because the response (OK) is accepted but then Darryl is nominated. The nomination of Darryl indicates that the subject is not closed, that more remains to be said and therefore that Mike's response, although partially acceptable, was nonetheless incomplete. In the teacher turn #22a, Darryl's response is treated again in a manner that can be seen as combining positive and negative

evaluation. It is first accepted with an OK indicating positive evaluation. But then a subsequent probe and nomination indicate tacit negative evaluation. This too, could be called an evaluation withold pending student explanation. Following the student's response, the teacher's subsequent evaluative comment "We all experience what you just said" and (following the check for agreement) the probe "How come----?" both act as tacit negative evaluation. Undaunted, however, one student responds in #23b with a response that receives an evaluation withold, a side-sequence question that will need to be answered before evaluation will be forthcoming.

Interactional Analysis

Why might the teacher choose this probing aggressive style of questioning? First, and most importantly, it seems to work. The students seem to be successfully pushed into wrestling with the problem of Eve's split personality. For some students, this aggressive style might seem overwhelming. They might feel intimidated rather than challenged. However, the students who respond in this lesson seem comfortable about trying. Further, it may be that students are capable of and possibly enjoy handling the ambiguity of an evaluation withold or see the combined positive and negative evaluation as a challenge, as a stimulus for thought.

One curious thing about this lesson was the fact that two verbal interactional patterns seemed to be used. The first was the more probing aggressive style described above. The second was a more intimate, groping style evident in the segment that follows. Exchanges

#25 - #26 exemplify the second style.

24a: Did you see the movie?↑

24b: No

25a: No ..OK↑/ah/something like that is suggested in the movie/that the trauma/was so great .. that it caused the creation of a new personality↓.. Ah Duane↓

25b: Yeh/It could be that ah/you like/like you want to do something like that you know/go/go with the stronger personality Thinking about it (whether to do it or not) a person you know like is reading a lot of books and stuff like that (He's going to say) "I want to be just like ah/I want to be just like her (---?---)

26a: OK I think you'd have to put that together with trauma/you know that kind of idea that you/that several of you have expressed/put that together with trauma In other words/if you try to imitate/imitate as a little child/your/idols/and you were severely punished for it/this is just one general example/then/ah/for whatever reasons/you might be forced/to split in two .... I think that's the only way I can put it together It's been a long time since I read that Aaah Yvonne↓..

26b: OK um (--?--) OK Isn't it true that/whatever/your/your OK whatever your conscious mind turns out/you subconscious reacts don't it/ Right now say she's saying to herself .... ahm she's getting in her mind that/she wants to be just like that lady and/her her subconscious

mind's gonna pick up on that and react on that/and she's gonna start acting like a certain person/doing the same kind of things that certain person do/ahm you know She's gonna pick up that personality act that person ...

The Two Exchanges (#25 and #26)

Speech Act Analysis

In exchange #25, the teacher refers back to a prior student response in exchange #23 where the student had been discussing Eve's background and then the teacher nominates Duane. Duanes turn is a comment elaborating the teacher statement. Teacher turn #26a is a long integrating turn where he pulls together the notions that have been suggested previously about idols with the notion of trauma. Here, the teacher makes explicit what the idol model is. This is followed by a student comment in #26b elaborating on the notion of imitation the teacher suggested in #25a.

Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis is somewhat revealing here when one tries to examine further the relations between prior and next turns. Exchanges #25 and #26 seem to b codeable as statement/comment adjacency pairs. A problem with this coding, however, is that it should be based on the relevance between statement and comment. In exchange #25, the student comment does seem to be based on and conditionally relevant to the teacher statement. In exchange #26, however, the teacher presents a rather complex idea - the integration of imitation and trauma and explicates the idol model. The student comment in #26b, however, is

not a comment on the teacher statement of #26a. The student does not discuss the idol model. Instead, the student comment is a further comment on the teacher statement in #25a. In short, the statement/comment form is there only the comment is not really relevant to the statement as far as the specific topic is concerned.

Interactional Analysis

This demonstrates an interesting feature of exchanges that take the form of statement/comment. Just as in the question/answer format where a student may be responding not to an explicit question but to an implicit question asked a few turns back, so in the statement/comment format, the comment may not be actually specifically topic relevant. This lack of cohesion may indicate a problem associated with speed of thought - a student thinks of a response or a comment a certain time after the initiating question or statement has occurred and in the meantime given the speed of typical exchanges, a new topic may already have been introduced.

Quantitative Analysis of PR (The Partial Problematic Lesson)

Predominant Exchange Patterns

The teacher question/student answer is the most common exchange pattern, occurring in 10 of the 28 exchanges. Another relatively common form is the teacher statement followed by a teacher question which then receives a response. This occurs in 7 of the 28 exchanges. A third common form is the teacher statement/student response. This occurs in 8 of the 28 exchanges.

Indirect questions are not common. Questions and commands are

direct.

There are three student questions to the teacher. Two of these receive a number of student responses.

Although students talk at the same time on several occasions, these seem to be simultaneous attempts to answer the teacher question, rather than comments on one another's contributions.

Evaluation

The most common forms of evaluation are the combined tacit positive and tacit negative evaluation where the teacher probes for justification of a student response without first stating that the response is either acceptable or not, and the evaluation withold. These occur in 10 of the 28 exchanges. Tacit positive evaluation occurs 6 times and tacit negative evaluation 7 times. Explicit positive evaluation moves occur 5 times.

Topic Control

Most of the time, the teacher keeps tight control of the topic by soliciting information in teacher directed question/answer sequences.

He introduces all the topics and is in charge of topic shifts.

To focus the topic, he uses short clear questions, statements and commands as well as longer turns involving longer statements combined with questions. He may also (a) repeat a response and immediately ask another question, (b) repeat his prior question, (c) ask a clarifying question, (d) take a long summarizing turn, (e) talk loudly in combination with question repetition, (f) ask a student to elaborate, and (g) restate a prior student comment.

After a series of 9 exchanges that clarify the facts, a series of

8 exchanges that deal with how Eve's problem might be solved and a series of 6 exchanges discussing Eve's childhood, the remaining 5 exchanges are used to consolidate and integrate, pulling together what has been stated or suggested previously in the form of explanatory models.

The teacher turns are longer on average in these last 5 exchanges, integrating prior student comments.

Major topic shifts are related to prior student comment in two cases whereas they seem to be related to the teacher's agenda on the three other occasions.

Connectives like "Well" and "so" and "now" are not common, occurring only 3 times in the 28 exchanges.

Generally, student comments are related to prior teacher questions or statements rather than to other student utterances.

Other Conversational Management Factors

The teacher talks 36% of the time but teacher/student turns are a relatively high 78% (as coded in the Dillon analysis).

Some background noise is tolerated. When the teacher is vague about the facts in the first few exchanges there is a considerable amount of overlapping student comment. Generally the teacher throws out a question, waits a bit and then nominates. Quite often, a number of students start to respond but the teacher eliminates the noise by focusing the topic.

Although simultaneous student attempts to respond seem to be encouraged, the teacher is quick to eliminate the noise. Student questions and interruptions are not encouraged.

The teacher does not contribute his own perceptions and

experiences or offer suggestions as to how problems might be solved though he does identify the idol and conflict models.

Slang occurs on one occasion but the resulting noise is squashed. There is no joking or teasing.

There is no instance of teacher talk occurring in the background.

WB (The Partial Dialectic Lesson)

General Description of the Lesson

This lesson has been coded by Roby (1985) as an example of a "Dialectic Discussion" where opposing views are brought to bear. The most striking feature of this lesson segment is that teacher turns are long and include both questions and statements. In addition, all teacher turns are contingent on prior student turns and they all tend to summarize or draw conclusions or to point to similarities and differences - in short to integrate and elaborate on prior student comment. There is also a lot of praise and support of student comments. The subject matter is affective rather than cognitive. Personal experience and real life problems are addressed. Discussion here can be conceived of in two ways simultaneously: first, as expressing relevant feelings, observations and opinions and second, as integrating and elaborating these explicated feelings and opinions into some coherent form - in this case the dialectically opposed frameworks of parental authority then and now. Because it can be conceived of in these two ways simultaneously, it has been coded as a partial dialectic lesson.

Paralinguistic Cues

The teacher's voice is medium pitched. The pace seems a little slow. There are only 10 exchanges. Both teacher and student turns contain hesitations and attempts to clarify ideas and pragmatic particles like "you know" and "like". The intonation of both teacher and student turns is falling characteristic of statements.

Qualitative Analysis of Transcript WB (The Dialectic Lesson)

The sample analyzed here is exchanges #8 and #9 and the first part of exchange #10.

8a: All right/How/how do you maintain the respect?/ Ahm Steve was you know that's another problem/ Ahm is there a way to really ask for/the reasons and that sort of thing without being disrespectful?↑/And where your parents can really maintain their/their decision as your parents/without without/without having to/say Well I said so/that's gotta be the way it is?↓ Do you want to talk about that?

8b: You don't really lose no respect for them/by questioning them/if they tell you to do something you could ask them why you want to do it/and they'll tell you But if they still want you to do it/you still gotta do it no matter what /No matter what the reasons/if they tell you to do it you gotta do it

9a: So in the end/the respect might come from/ahm accepting their wisdom whether you ahm understand it or not, huh?↑

9b: My parents will say(---?---)

(laughter)

10a: OK↓ And yet/you know/ as Regina was saying in the past it did tend to be more like that↓ that/parents were considered/kinda/total authorities and/and/I mean it seemed like it wasn't/a completely/impossible situation/you know for people to live like that/for you know long times/Ah and yet for us/it just doesn't seem quite right↓ if/if you don't/have at least the opportunity to hear the reasons why/ (---?---)

10b: (---?---)

T: OK↑..... Chris↑

10c: (---?---) our family has respect/and all that kind of thing Ahm when my parents ask us to do something like housework/ahm there's no question because you know housework has to be done/And ah/so if it does come to questioning why do they do things/they do (you're free?---?---BELL---) Both my parents they didn't have ah/you know/when they were children they didn't have the/strict parents you have to do this/that's it My mother was in the hospital all her life My father was in an orphanage/They never had/you know the strict parents So when it came to us/we were just like/they/treated us as little people (---?---) I dunno There was always respect/And yet whenever we wanted it (---?---) you know they like to hear/what we didn't understand

T: OK Good ↓ Tommy ↑

The First Exchange

Speech Act Analysis

This exchange begins with a teacher turn containing a number of moves. It begins with an accept of a prior student move. Then there is a question followed by a statement followed by another question and an elaborating continuation of the second question. Finally, there is a third question where the teacher asks whether or not the student would like to address the issues raised.

Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis reveals that neither the first question, nor the second nor the elaboration constitute first pair parts of any adjacency pair because no response is forthcoming and because no space is provided following these moves in which a response might occur. It is equally true, however, that no space is provided following the final question which does in fact receive a reply. Perhaps then, it is necessary to examine other features to see what might indicate that a student response is in order. The teacher's first question "How do you maintain that respect?", the subsequent statement "Ahm Steve, you know that's another problem" relate back to the prior student turn and appear to serve more as comments on the content of the prior turn than as questions demanding responses. The wording and the placement of the subsequent question asked with rising intonation "Ahm Is there a way to really ask for/the reasons and that sort of thing without being disrespectful?" would seem on the contrary to indicate that it is

intended to receive a response as would the wording and the placement of the elaboration that follows. It may simply be that when no students seem to be forthcoming (as indicated perhaps by some non-verbal means not visible on audio tape such as lowered eyes) the teacher continues questioning to clarify the topic, to avoid embarassing silences and to allow the student a little time to think before speaking.

As discussed previously in the analysis of HK, the teacher in the recitation lesson about George Washington appears to have used a similar strategy. And yet though one could say both teachers use a strategy of repeated clarifying questions in a turn, the tone in the two examples is qualitatively different. Why? The most important difference between the two has to do with the relation of teacher turn to prior student turn. In the recitation example, the teacher questions do not build on prior student responses. They come from the teacher's agenda. In the dialectic example, however, the teacher questions and statements are based on the prior response and seem to be an attempt to clarify issues raised by that student. In the recitation example, the questions are short and concise and ask for answers the teacher already knows. In the dialectic example, a number of different responses would be appropriate and there are no right or wrong answers, just statements of personal opinion. Further, in the recitation example, the second elaborative question does not elaborate extensively. In effect, it adds the one focus "strategy". In the dialectic interaction, the elaboration is much more extensive and offers a variety of focuses for subsequent discussion. These differences may account in part for why the response in the recitation exchange is a short factual explanation whereas the response in the

dialectic setting is more elaborated. The above comparison points to the danger of suggesting that the use of certain strategies is good or bad or is responsible for causing answers to take one specific form or another. It is not sufficuent to look at the effects of specific strategies in isolation from other important contextual features that may also have a bearing on the quality of the response elicited.

Interactional Analysis

Why might the teacher use this technique? First, it is clearly encouraging or conciliatory behaviour on the part of the teacher toward the student to allow the topic focus to be based on student contributions, here specifically on the notion of respect. Second, this is the only exchange in the interview where the teacher asks a series of questions. As Dillon has pointed out, question turns are only 40% of this teacher's exchanges. It would appear then, following the question "Is there a way to ask for/the reasons and that sort of thing without being disrespectful?" both the subsequent elaboration ending in falling intonation and containing a number of hesitations as well as the subsequent low key question "Do you want to talk about that?" may function as mitigating devices that serve to diminish the demanding nature of the prior question.

Exchanges #9 and #10.

Speech Act Analysis

Exchange #9 begins with a statement plus tag question checking for agreement. It receives a response that elaborates more than the agreement required. Exchange #10 begins with a teacher accept move of

"OK" and then continues with a statement comparing past and present conceptions of parenthood. Following an indecipherable student response in #10b, the teacher accepts it (OK) and then nominates Chris. In #10c, Chris utters a fairly lengthy reply discussing how her parents treat her with respect. Following her response, the teacher accepts it with "OK Good" and then nominates the next student, Tommy. Tommy's turn is also followed by an accept of "OK" and a nomination of Regina. Both Tommy and Regina's turns have not been included in the sample.

Conversation Analysis

Exchange #9 is a question/answer adjacency pair although the question indicated by the tag "huh" is so low key that the exchange could almost as easily be characterized as a statement/comment adjacency pair. In exchange #10, the teacher's turn begins with an accept "OK" of the prior student comment concluding exchange #9. Then the teacher makes a long statement presumably relating the prior student's remark with the response in exchange #2 of Regina who discussed generational differences. The teacher embellishes on what Regina had said by adding that while parents used to be considered total authorities, people lived with that, though for us it doesn't seem right. His long statement is marked by a number of hesitations and pragmatic particles such as "you know" and "I mean". Following an indecipherable student response in #10b, the teacher accepts it and nominates Chris. Chris' turn in #10c is long and elaborate stating that her family has respect, if asked to do housework they do it because it has to get done, that her parents had deprived backgrounds with no strict parents of their own and hence they treat their children as little people but they are willing to listen. Like the teacher's

turn in #10a, this turn also has a style punctuated by hesitations and "you know"s. This exchange is difficult to code in adjacency pairs because of the lack of #10b but it is interesting to note that the quality or style of response 10c is very like the quality of the teacher turn in #10a.

Interactional Analysis

Ostman (1981) has noted that when one person begins to use pragmatic particles like "you know", they tend also to be scattered through neighbouring turns. It would seem here that the teacher's introduction of "you know"s and hesitations in #10a may have had a part in the student in #10c phrasing her turn as a series of statements also using "you know" a number of times. It is true also, however, that "you know"s are more likely to be included in longer turns where some kind of check that the message is getting through might seem necessary. In any case, this style of communication seems very relaxed and conducive to elaborating on personal experiences.

Quantitative Analysis of WB (The Partial Dialectic Lesson)

Predominant Exchange Patterns

Teacher turns take a variety of forms:

1. a series of statements, a check and a nomination (#1)
2. an evaluation, a statement, a question, a statement, a question (#2)
3. an evaluation and a question (#3)
4. a response to a student question (#4)
5. an evaluative comment and a nomination (#5)
6. a short clarification request (#6)

7. a question, a statement, a question, an elaborative statement and a question, (#8)

8. a tag question (#9)

9. a series of statements (#10)

Questions tend to be related to prior student comments and integrate or clarify or elaborate what was said. They ask for opinion, not facts. Questions are modulated by being interspersed with statements.

Evaluation

Evaluation is not of the correctness of the response. Instead it seems to be more a comment on the appropriateness of the response and how it contributes to the discussion.

Topic Control

The teacher directs flow rather than solicits.

The teacher keeps relatively tight control of the topic.

Topics are not so much introduced as refocused from prior student comments using connectives like "so" and "and yet".

There are no open ended questions. The teacher/student sequencing is tight. On one occasion, repeated questions are used to focus the topic (#8).

Teacher turns are not direct, challenging, probing questions. The questions, when they occur, are modulated in a number of ways: (a) by tags (e.g., do you think?"), (b) by being preceded by reflective clarifying statements and/or positive evaluation moves and/or expressions of personal opinion, (c) by questions being followed by elaboration of their content and invitations like "Do you want to talk

about that?"

This teacher uses summarizing statements. Unlike the other teachers, however, they are short and common, occuring in 6 of the 10 turns.

The turns at talk are long.

Both teacher and student turns are contingent on (i.e., precipitated by and incorporating) prior turns. But because the teacher turn typically contains comments integrating prior student comments, subsequent student comments tend to be directed to prior student remarks as mediated by the teacher's integrative comments.

Other Conversational Management Factors

The teacher talks 33% of the time but if one counts teacher nominations as teacher turns then 100% of the turns are teacher/student turns.

There is no noise and rarely simultaneous talk.

Student interruption is not encouraged. In one case it is preempted by the teacher question. In one case, a teacher response follows.

Frequent nominations and evaluations discourage student/student talk. Student comments tend to be addressed to teacher remarks although the teacher remarks incorporate prior student expressed opinions.

The teacher expresses his own personal opinions but not his experiences.

Students are called by first names.

There is no slang, joking or teasing.

Backchannel support is used on occasion (e.g., "um hmm") to

encourage a student to continue responding.

There is no fading into the background with this teacher's comments. He never makes a bid to speak that is disregarded.

SN (The Permissive Discussion)

General Description of the Lesson

Roby (1985) has classified this as a "Permissive Discussion" because taboo subject matter is addressed and students are encouraged to contribute observations, feelings and opinions. The predominant interactional feature of this lesson is the teacher's use of short reflective statements instead of questions. In order to reflect the importance of student contribution and topic direction, a new coding scheme was necessitated: (student)statement/(teacher)comment/(student)comment. This is markedly different from the typical question/answer/feedback format of the classroom. The teacher's interactional style in this lesson is supportive rather than demanding. The subject matter is affective rather than cognitive. It is centered around personal experience. Because the teacher's role is one of facilitating student contributions, of getting students to express their observations, feelings and opinions, the model here is discussion as expressing.

Paralinguistic Cues

The teacher's voice is medium pitched. The pace does not seem hurried. (There are 29 exchanges in the 10 minute lesson). There are pauses between and within teacher turns but little use of pragmatic

particles. The majority of the teacher comments have falling intonation contours. Though there is not a lot of changing intonation, the talk is not monotonous. The tone is quiet and relaxed.

Qualitative Analysis of Transcript SN (The Permissive Discussion)

The sample analyzed here is of exchanges #14 - #17.

14a: You all do this together?↓

14b: Yeah My mother and father and all the rest of us And just like he said "control"/In a way I understand because you have to .. specialize what you mean You can't use slang [you know

T: [Yeah

14b: like/vulgar language

T: Or street language

14b: You can't use that But you can express "What do you mean? What is this?" ..

15a: So there is a time you're saying for questions and answers?↓

.....

15b: Um Hm

16a: Um you seem to feel good about that ....

16b: In a way yes 'cause (---?---)

T: Larry

16c: That's .. something like that I think is/is good too because it / makes for more openness ... Members of the family can talk in a/sense you know .....

17a: Helps to tie it up .....

(Cough and laughter from the class)

17a: (--?---)

S: (---?---)

17a: Ah John ↑

17b: (---?---) Ahm .. my parents talked

T: Talk louder

17b: They talked to me about this/you know they'd discuss about sex and all that . But/I/feel/like ahm/a lot of times I feel uncomfortable talking about sex I know that (---?---)

(laughter from the class)

The First Two Exchanges

Speech Act Analysis.

In #14, the teacher makes a statement clarifying whether or not the student asked discusses sex with all her family members together, a clarification based on a prior student response. The statement asks for agreement or disagreement. In her response (#14b), however, the student agrees "Yeah" and then begins to elaborate on what happens in the family discussions. The teacher overlaps this response with "Yeah" on one occasion and adds a clarifying statement "Or street language" on another. Following the teacher's clarifying statement, the student continues with two further clarifying statements completing the response coded as #14b. In turn #15, the teacher makes another statement, echoing the students responses in #14b and 13c and again the student agrees.

Conversation Analysis

As has been discussed previously in analysis of prior segments, yes/no questions often serve as presequences to more complex questions and as a result, the very asking of a yes/no question may imply a more complex question. In this case, however, the accepting and simultaneously clarifying statement which also requires a response of "yes" or "no" as an indication of agreement or disagreement also receives an elaborated response as though the statement may also have carried some implicit meaning. If one looks at the content of the elaborated response, however, one can see that it relates back to the

content of exchanges #7, #8, #9 and #10, where one student states that talk about sex was controlled and a discussion of control ensues. Hence, instead of a teacher's statement in #14 acting either as a presequence or as having some implicit meaning, it might be more reasonable to suggest that the student in possession of a turn at talk has some other comments relevant to the general discussion that she wishes to add and that given she has the floor, it would be an apropriate time to do so. The student does not take up a similar opportunity in turn #15, however. The teacher's turn #15a is also interesting because of the simultaneous functions it appears to serve. First, it might appear to function as an evaluative feedback comment on the prior student response because it accepts and because it occurs in the evaluation slot. However, because it is a reflective comment, not containing any overt teacher evaluation such as "Good", it seems simultaneously, albeit retrospectively, to turn the prior student utterance into a statement rather than a response, and treat it as a first pair part of a statement/comment adjacency pair which then receives a student evaluation move in the form of an agreement.

Interactional Analysis

The salient question to be asked here is why the teacher makes use of reflective or echoic statements in his turn at talk and why he uses the back channel supports of "Yeah" and "Or street language" during the student's turn to respond. It would appear that the reflective statement like the implicit question is a polite or face-saving device the teacher uses to encourage student comment. Part of the reason why it may function to encourage student comment is because of the accepting or tacit positive evaluation that occurs

simultaneously when an echoic statement is uttered. It could be suggested further that the use of the reflective or echoic statement is even more polite or even less face-threatening than the implicit question because it asks only for agreement or disagreement, nothing more, while it simultaneously accepts what has been said. Backchannel supports are in keeping with this supportive style of using reflective statements rather than questions.

The Second Two Exchanges.

Speech Act Analysis

In exchange #16, the teacher begins with a statement saying "You seem to feel good about that". This statement again requires simply a "yes" or "no" response. Again, however, it receives a more elaborated answer. Following the response, the teacher nominates another student who makes two statements expressing his opinion about family discussions about sex. Then in exchange #17, the teacher makes another statement addressing the content of the prior student response. Following a cough and then some laughter and some indecipherable teacher and student comments, the teacher nominates another student "John". John's turn (#17b) is interrupted by a teacher exhortation to "Talk louder". Then John continues with a factual statement followed by a statement describing his feelings and a third indecipherable remark. Student laughter ensues.

Conversation Analysis

The teacher's comment in #16a addressing how the student feels receives an elaborated response although only a simple "yes" or "no" is

required. As in prior cases discussed, it could be argued that this yes/no statement accepting and enquiring into the student's feelings is a presequence to be followed by a "why?" question. Or, it could be seen as a sort of implied statement given that the student responds as if some elaboration was required. It is indeed curious that echoic statements seem to have this effect. Following the nomination, Larry's response (#16c) seems to function as an evaluative comment on the prior student responses in #14b, 15b and #16b. This response contains a number of pauses and is folowed by a 4 second pause before the teacher makes a further accepting and clarifying comment in #17a. Because this comment accepts, it can be seen simultaneously as tacitly positively evaluating. Again, as in the case of the teacher comment in #15a, this comment seems to function simultaneously though retrospectively as the second part of a statement/comment pair, initiated by the student in #16b. It is followed by a cough, laughter and indecipherable comments from students and teacher. Conversation analysis of the rest of exchange #17 reveals no more than the speech act analysis.

Interactional Analysis

The teacher's use of echoic reflective statements could be seen as a skillful device for abdicating control of topic while still remaining in control.

Quantitative Analysis of SN (The Permissive Discussion)

Predominant Exchange Patterns

A new coding scheme was necessary here to convey the importance of the student contributions and the manner in which they directed the

topic. The most common exchange pattern has been coded in the unusual form of (student) statement/(teacher)comment/(student)comment. Typically, these exchangese were initiated by a teacher reflective statement of some sort. They occurs in 13 of the 29 exchanges. Typical question/answer exchanges occur in 9 of the exchanges while teacher statement/student comment exchanges occur 4 times. There are two exchanges where students ask questions of the teacher and one exchange where one student asks another a question.

Evaluation

There seems to be no real evaluations of content. Teacher comments like "O.K." seem instead to be acknowledgements rather then evaluations of student contributions. There are 7 explicit teacher acknowledgements of student comments and 10 similar student acknowledgements of student comments (e.g., "Right". "Yeah"). The small number of explicit teacher acknowledgements, however, does not really convey the positive feeling of this lesson because the teacher comments following student statements act as tacit acknowledgments. Even the clarification requests assume a different flavour here because insead of partially positively and partially negatively evaluating the content of a response, they seem to be tacit positive evaluations where the teacher is simply asking for further information which may then be acknowledged further.

Topic Control

This teacher does not keep tight control over the topic.

He introduces the topic prior to the beginning of the tape and on one occasion responds to a student question about what the topic was by

outlining it as nudity, talk about sex and physical affection.

Students are encouraged to take control of the topic, to elaborate according to their own personal experiences and observations. On one occasion, the topic is focussed by the teacher picking up on a student introduced topic and formulating a couple of questions from it. On another occasion, after a pause, he tries to re-introduce a topic by simply stating "What about affection?" On yet another occasion, he remembers a prior student remark and asks for agreement or disagreement. When the teacher tries to move the discussion from "talk about sex" to nudity and physical affection, he does so without much success. The conversation shifts for only one or two exchanges. Mostly, he offers reflective statements and some clarifying questions.

There is very little consolidation and summarization. After a number of exchanges, the teacher simply says "Let's go on to the last topic". Although topics are addressed, no conclusions are reached.

New topics are introduced when the conversation seems to fail (when a pause of 3 seconds occurred.)

Student comments seem to be successive responses to a teacher utterance rather then really contingent on one another.

Other Conversational Management Factors

This teacher talk 22% of the time though the percentage of teacher/student turns is higher (58% according to Dillon's original analysis)

Only one person talks at a time typically. The reflective statements tend to be directed to one person.

Student interruptions (3x) and student comments on one another's contributions (1x) are rare as are student questions to the teacher

(2x).

The teacher contributes his own personal perceptions and experiences. No suggestions are made toward the solving of a problem - a problem is not really being discussed.

The teacher addresses students by their first names.

There is no slang. Joking and teasing are not common.

Backchannel comments are not common though the reflective comments have the same effect.

MK (The Bull Session)

General Description of the Lesson

Roby has classed this as a "Bull Session", where participants throw out unexamined opinions, empty generalizations, cliches and ideosyncratic sallies and where the right answers are unexamined right opinions. The predominant feature of this lesson is the amount of student/student interaction, particularly the amount of student evaluation. The teacher does not seem to be strongly in charge. Clearly, students are encouraged to question, challenge and evaluate one another's contributions. The subject matter is affective rather than cognitive. Students are contributing their feelings and opinions about smoking rights. As in the case of SN (The Permissive Discussion lesson), the model of discussion seems to be expressing observations, feelings and opinions. Again, the teacher's role seems to be one of facilitating student contributions - only here (vs. SN) the teacher seems to want to do it as an equal without the authority of higher status (i.e. without being in charge of most of the exchanges.)

Paralinguistic Cues

The teacher's voice is medium pitched. The teacher's pace seems neither noticeably fast or slow (There are 19 coded exchanges according to Dillon's classification scheme, though this number is misleading because of the amount of student/student interaction that is not coded as separate exchanges.) Teacher turns typically contain hesitations though pauses between turns are rare. Pauses following teacher questions 1 1/2 - 2 sec. pauses) occur only 3 times. Simularly there are only 3 occasions where pauses (1/2 sec.) occur after student contributions. When the teacher takes a long turn, it includes a number of pragmatic particles such as "you know" and "well". The majority of teacher questions and comments have falling intonation. The voice is expressive with changing intonation and word stress patterns. The tone seems somewhat agitated and excited.

Qualitative Analysis of Transcript MK (The Bull Session)

The sample analyzed here is what was coded in the Dillon analysis as the first two exchanges. They are as follows:

Note: There is background noise of students talking throughout the first exchange except at #1d and #1j

1a: OK Does anybody have/anybody have any feelings [about it ↓

S: [(---?---) on tape

1a: Alright Don't worry about the tape ↓ Does anybody have any/does anybody have any strong feelings about that/about what happened about the seniors/having their priveliges taken away? ↓

1b: I think (---?---)

S: Yeh (---?---)

S: Seniors should do what they want

Ss: laughter and noise

1c: Seniors should do what they want [Seniors keep walking off

T: [OK John

1d: If the seniors can't handle it/the juniors will handle it

1e: Oh (---?---) Why can't you smoke? (---?---either)

1f: Why can't you just smoke cigarettes at this school?

1g: Cause it's illegal

1h: Why?

1i: Cause you're a minor

S: Wah

1j: Cause like at Loyola . and Loyola is just as strict as this school you can't um seniors can smoke there

S: Yeh

1k: Yeh but they probably got a whole lounge

1i: I don't see why just because of what a few kids did the rest of us have to suffer

1l: It's not fair

T: (---/---) environment (---?---) doesn't it?

1m: Yeh just because it's (---?---) problem doesn't mean (---?---) this neighborhood

T: (---?---)

1n: What if you're 18?

Note: There is background noise of students talking throughout the second exchange until the teacher says "Now say that again" following the first part of turn 2c.

2a: Still can't The reason/the reason we say that if you're

18/is/because ah if we let/people/who/are/going to school here it'd be kind of a/two-faced/let people who are 18 smoke in front of people who are not 18 and they [smoke]

2b: [Then] why do they let the teachers smoke?

T: You know personally what I think well

2c: I think the teachers are justified and it's something the seniors have to decide amongst themselves

T: Now say that again

2c: The teachers are justified and it's something the seniors have to decide amongst themselves

The First Exchange (parts #1a - #1d)

Speech Act Analysis

In the first exchange, the teacher begins by asking "Does anybody have any feelings---?" and after an aside assuring students they need not worry about the tape, he rephrases his question. An adequate response to this question should be a number of "yes" or "no" responses from students but in addition it receives a series of student comments, related student questions and both teacher and student responses. Following what is coded as #1c, the teacher accepts #1c and then nominates a student who responds subsequently.

Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis is revealing here as it was in the analysis of HK (The Recitation Lesson) because retrospectively the teacher's "Does anybody---?" question can be seen as a presequence, one that would typically be followed by a question like "What are your feelings on this subject?" But, because the subsequent question is predictable, the "Does anybody---?" question is read as implying the subsequent question. In fact, as far as can be deciphered, the question receives only one "yeh" response to the explicit question (and even this may be a response to a prior student comment #1b, "I think---?---") Three other responses, #1b, #1c and #1d answer the implied question.

Interactional Analysis

Typically, a "Does anybody" question is not recommended in teachers' colleges because it is seen as an invitation to chaos. Because it invites many students to respond simultaneously, it is seen as threatening to teacher control. This transcript segment, however, shows that such questions can also be seen as stimulating because the question does seem to elicit some worthwhile interaction. Students immediately begin discussing the issue and arging pros and cons with one another.

The First Exchange (parts #1e - #1n)

Speech Act Analysis

The student move #1e is an unanswered question. Student moves #1f and #1g constitute a question and its response. The moves #1h, #1j and the subsequent student utterence "Wah" are a student

question/answer/evaluation sequence. Next, there is a student statement #1j overlapped partially by a student evaluation "yeh" and another student evaluation move and an explanation. These statement/evaluation sequences are then followed by #1i and #1m, position statements that receive some comment from both students and teacher although it is difficult to decipher with all the background noise. Finally, #1n is a student question that receives a response in what has been coded as the second exchange. Clearly, what has been coded as one exchange is better seen as a series of exchanges where students raise questions, respond to one another and make position statements about the issue of seniors smoking privileges.

Conversation Analysis

Utterances #1e - #1n are in the main student question/answer, question/answer/evaluation and statement/comment sequences centered around the topic of senior smoking privileges. Students here, when they are talking with one another use a question/answer format twice and a statement/comment format three times. (In other analyses of student/student discourse, I have observed that the statement/comment format seems to occur more commonly than the question/answer format) The teacher does not control the interaction tightly through teacher directed question/answer sequences. His talk occurs more as part of the class, as though he is one of the students agreeing or disagreeing with another perhaps as part of a small subgroup that is discussing a particular aspect of the problem.

Interactional Analysis

Student exchanges of the statement/comment type might be seen as

less demanding and hence more polite than question/answer sequences. They invite rather than demand a response. Because they diminish rather than enhance status differences, they may be a more appropriate form for peer interaction. This teacher in this exchange uses four strategies that could be seen as encouraging peer interaction. First, he makes his comments fit in like those of a student (e.g., between #1l and #1m). Second, he uses statements and tags rather than asking questions (e.g., between #1l and #1m). Third, he makes his questions sound like statements inviting comments (e.g., "Does anybody ...?" in #1a). Fourth, he asks students to repeat comments that he evidently considers worth listening to.

The Second Exchange.

Speech Act Analysis

Again what has been coded for other purposes as one exchange is actually better coded as a number of smaller exchanges. The first teacher utterance is actually a response to a prior student question (#2a) followed by a teacher explanation. In #2b, a student asks a question to which the teacher begins to reply. However, his attempt to reply is interrupted by a student statement (#2c). The teacher then asks the student to repeat his statement which the student does along with an elaboration.

Conversation Analysis

What is unusual in this series of utterances in a school setting is the occurrance of a student question that receives a teacher's attempted response and where the teacher's attempted response is

interrupted and his turn taken over by the student.

Interactional Analysis

Why might the teacher allow this? I would suggest that this is yet another strategy for encouraging peer interaction and consequently student expression because by allowing student interruptions, the teacher demonstrates diminished teacher control and confirms a diminished status difference between student and teacher.

Quantitative Analysis of MK (The Bull Session)

Predominant Exchange Patterns

There are teacher questions in 15 of the 19 exchanges (as originally coded). These questions are different from the recitation type because the teacher does not have access to the information (opinion) that is forthcoming. Three of the questions are open-ended (e.g. "Does anybody...?") inviting simultaneous response from a number of students. Following a number of simultaneous response attempts, the teacher then calls upon one of the students to repeat his response. Most unusual is the number of student-initiated exchanges (though they were not originally coded as such). Altogether, there were 3 (student)question/(student)answer/(student)evaluation exchanges, 7 (student)statement,(student) comment pairs, 5 (student)question/(teacher) answer/(student)evaluation exchanges and 6 (student)statement/(teacher)comment exchanges.

Evaluation

The evaluation moves here, as in the case of SN (The Permissive

Discussion) do not seem concerned with the correctness of the response. They are more acknowledgements than evaluations. Seven explicit evaluation/acknowledgement moves were noted. There were many more student evaluation moves (18) than teacher evaluation moves (e.g., "Yeah", "Right", "Get out of here", "Wah, Wah, Wah"). Contrary to the teacher evaluation moves, student evaluation moves agreed or disagreed strongly with prior student comments. These moves were about equally divided as to whether the evaluation was positive or negative.

Topic Control

This teacher does not keep tight control of the topic. He introduces the topic initially as "Does anybody have any strong feelings about...?" and the talk ensues. On one occasion when the teacher tries to make a contribution, his turn at talk is interruped and preempted by student turns. Topic is shifted once by the teacher when he attemps to get the students to relate the open talk to Christian behaviour.

To focus the topic, the teacher tends to ask one student to repeat his or her response that had occurred originally simultaneously along with a number of others. In addition, he asks and states his own views in longer turns. But for a large part of the lesson, students interact with one another without apparant guidance from the teacher.

There is no consolidation or summarization although the teacher does try once to clarify the problem being discussed (e.g."You know, the way I understand the problem is ..."). As a result the discussion doesn't seem to cover ground. No conclusions are reached.

Here the student turns relate to prior and subsequent student turns. They are not successive responses related predominantly to a

teacher utterance. The teacher facilitates this by allowing so much student/student talk.

Other Conversational Factors

The teacher talks 34% of the time (according to the Dillon analysis) though less that 1/4 of the turns are teacher/student turns.

Typically, there is a lot of overlap, simultaneous student talk, background noise and calling out. (Students may be trying answers out on friends or in small groups without fear of negative evaluation?)

Student evaluations and interruptions are common.

The teacher contributes his own opinions, feelings and observations and suggestions toward the solving of a mutual problem.

Students and teacher address one another by first names.

Slang seems tolerated (e.g., "nic fit") but not common. Joking and teasing of students and teacher are accepted.

Backchannel comments are common.

On occasion, the teacher comments occurr in the background as part of one or a number of simultaneously occurring small group discussions.

Summary and Discussion

Two sociolinguistic analyses of the 5 lessons were conducted. Initially, considerable variation in the five teachers' verbal interactional styles was found and it was difficult to see similarities because of the differences. The "Quiz Show" or "Recitation" lesson (HK) was perhaps the easiest to analyse. Topic control was tight. The teacher used question/answer sequences predominantly to request recall of facts and explanations from previously studied material. Generally,

topics were shifted by the teacher apparently according to some pre-planned agenda. Hence, these shifts tended not to be contingent on (i.e. precipitated by and incorporate) prior student input. The "Partial Problematic" lesson (PR) was more difficult. It was relabelled "Partial Problematic" rather than Problematic for two reasons. First, part of the lesson was Recitation, asking for recalled information while part of the lesson seemed to be a joint searching for explanations and explanatory models on the part of both teacher and students. In short, it seemed partly Recitation and partly not Recitation. Second, that part that was not Recitation did not seem to be genuinely Problematic because it did not contain episodes of critical reflection, backtracking, review or revision, comparing, for example, the pros and cons of the different explanatory models. The problem being discussed was not a Perennial Puzzler - a topic like "All men are created equal" where a variety of explanations and/or interpretations is possible and where there are no boundaries delineated by a course that needs to be covered. Instead, it is what Roby has termed a "Particular Puzzler" - a course centered problem was being addressed: possible solutions and explanatory models for the three faces of Eve. This lesson was difficult to examine because it seemed to consist of two different verbal interactional styles related to two different models of discussion. One style contained three common verbal interactional forms - the question/answer, the statement,question/answer and the statement/comment. This was geared to explicating facts. The other was a statement/comment approach. It seemed geared toward the joint explication of more complex integrated explanations. Here both teacher and student turns were longer and more groping.

In both the Recitation lesson and the first part of the Partial Problematic lesson, course-covering seemed to be a priority. Discussion here seemed to be the joint achievement by student and teacher of text-relevant facts and explanations. Where recall of previously learned facts and simple explanations were sought, questioning was predominant. In the latter part of the Partial Problematic lesson, discussion seemed to be integrating facts with possible explanations and explanatory models. The role of the teacher in both these lessons seemed to be one of guiding or controlling the joint teacher/student achievement of text-relevant facts and explanations. Sometimes these facts and explanations seemed to be given in the text (in the Recitation). At other times, they were not contained in the text, though clearly related to concepts contained in the text (in the latter part of the Partial Problematic lesson). These two lessons then revealed a model of discussion as subject-oriented course-covering. In the latter part of the Partial Problematic lesson, however, a different model of discussion was present as well: integrating (in this case, integrating facts with theoretical models). The product/process distinction distinguishes between these two approaches to subject matter. The Recitation is concerned with products - facts and simple explanations. The latter part of the Partial Problematic lesson is concerned with process - with the process of integrating facts with more complex explanations.

In sum, teacher HK (the Recitation lesson) retained tight control of the topic through utilizing tight question/answer sequences. The model of discussion was discussion as course-covering. Teacher PR (the Partial Problematic lesson) also retained tight control of the topic typically through use of three forms - the question/answer, the

statement,question/answer and the statement/comment. These patterns, when used together, were associated with a model of discussion as course-covering. In the latter part of the PR lesson, however, where the statement/comment form was used almost exclusively and where control over the topic was not so tight, the model of discussion seemed to be integrating facts with alternative explanatory models. It is really unfortunate that this example of a Problematic lesson was not more consistently problematic. This lesson was instead somewhere between Recitation and Problematic.

A third lesson (SN) was coded by Roby as "Informational Discussion" because it dealt with taboo subject matter - sex. I preferred to relabel this as "Permissive Discussion". The term "informational" seemed confusing as discussions are all informational in some way. This was a lesson in a course on marriage and the topic for discussion was talk about sex, nudity and expression of physical affection in the home. The lesson was most interesting because of the predominant use of the teacher reflective statement. The teacher seemed, in this way, to introduce an exchange that was dominated by the student. To reflect the importance of the student contribution, it was recoded as (student)statement/(teacher)comment/(student)comment. The teacher did not control the direction of topic flow in any strong way. The result of his use of the reflective statement was to allow students to take control of the direction of topic flow. The model of discussion here was expressing observations, feelings and opinions. The role of the teacher was that of facilitator or almost of counsellor helping students achieve those ends.

A fourth lesson (MK), coded as a "Bull Session" contained the greatest amount of student/student interaction of all the lessons and

the widest variety of exchange patterns ranging from two-party to many-party. Again, the teacher did not guide the discussion in any strong way though the manner in which he abdicated control over the topic flow was different from that of SN (The Permissive Discussion). Here there were more student initiated exchanges than teacher initiated exchanges. And, there were almost twice as many student evaluation moves as teacher evaluation moves. Teacher questions were modulated in a number of ways such as being open-ended and including hesitations and rephrasings. The teacher was on first name basis with the students. Slang was acceptable. The teacher contributed his opinions as did the students. There was a lot of simultaneous talk and one time a student even interrupted and preempted the teacher turn! Student comments were based on one another's contributions. These features contributed to diminished status difference between teacher and students. Although there are certainly a number of differences between the verbal interactional patterns of this lesson and those of SN (The Permissive Discussion), the model of discussion here was the same - expressing feelings, observations and opinions. Again, the role of the teacher was that of facilitator or counsellor, helping students to achieve those ends.

Finally, there is a lesson (WB), coded by Roby as "Dialectic" because opposing views are explicated. Here, the verbal interactional style was different again. Both teacher and student turns were long and few. Teacher turns typically consisted of combinations of moves such as an evaluation, a statement, a question, a statement and another question. In each turn, the teacher integrated prior student comments. Explicit positive evaluation was common. This teacher combined agenda (in this case, the dialectical framework) with student contributions.

As in the case of PR (The Partial Problematic Lesson) two models of discussion were evident here though instead of existing side by side they seemed here to exist simultaneously: first expressing feelings, observations and opinions, and second, integrating and elaborating those expressed feelings, observations and opinions into some coherent form - in this case, the dialectically opposed frameworks of parental authority then and now. Unlike the case of PR (The Partial Problematic Lesson), however, these dual models seemed evident in each exchange.

In sum, the lessons analyzed here can be described by three tacit models of discussion: discussion as course-covering, discussion as expressing and discussion as integrating. (See Fig.1) The two lessons that seemed to be based predominantly on a course-covering model where topic control was relatively tight were HK (The Recitation lesson) and part of PR (The Partial Problematic lesson). In HK, the question/answer format was predominant. In PR, the question/answer and statement,question/answer and statement/comment forms were all used. In the latter part of the PR lesson, the statement/comment form was predominant, a form more associated with the expressing and integrating models. Two models were utilized in different parts of the PR lesson: the course-covering model and the integrating model. The two lessons that seemed to be based purely on an expressing model of discussion were SN (the Permissive Discussion) and MK (the Bull Session). Though their verbal interactional patterns were different, i.e., teacher SN made predominant use of the reflective statement whereas teacher MK threw open the floor to a lot of student/student interaction, in both cases teacher control of the topic was minimal. And in both cases, student observations, feelings and opinions were the focus of the lesson vs. more academically or subject oriented facts and

explanations. The third model, the integration model, was evident in part of teacher PR's lesson and also in part of teacher WB's style. Here, teacher turns were typically longer and often involved a positive evaluation move. Teacher WB's turns contained combinations of questions and statements integrating prior students' remarks in some way and some continuation indicating what might be addressed next were included in one turn at talk. In the integrating portion of teacher PR's lesson, statements rather than questions were used and the teacher utterances did not necessarily indicate possible future directions for talk. In both cases, student moves were long and the students expressed feelings and/or opinions and/or observations which were then integrated by the teacher. In teacher PR's integrating style, facts were integrated with possible explanatory models. In teacher WB's style, student expressed feelings, opinions and observations were integrated into an overall framework.

Human verbal interaction is complex and an exercise such as this double barrelled qualitative and quantitative examination of five different lessons draws attention to such complexity. Coding anything as an example of a group presents problems because of ideosyncratic and personal differences in verbal interactional patterns. Generalization becomes difficult. Sociolinguistic analysis of classroom discourse is valuable because it fleshes out important similarities and differences in verbal interactional patterns that more heavily statistical methods tend to pass over.

Although no necessary and exclusive one-to-one match between verbal interactional pattern and model of discussion was explicated, a strong relationship between models of discussion and certain kinds of

verbal interaction has been demonstrated. If one acknowledges that each of the five transcripts is representative of a class of discussion, then some legitimate preliminary conclusions about the nature of classroom discussion are as follows: Broadly, the question/answer format seems to be associated with the subject-matter oriented course-covering model. Broadly, lack of strong topic control (as achieved here through teacher use of the reflective statement and/or the teacher deferring to a lot of student/student interaction) plus a focus on expression of feelings, observations and opinions seems to be associated with the student-centered expressing model. Broadly, combinations of explicit positive evaluation moves and combinations of integrative questions and statements in single teacher turns at talk seem to be associated with the integrating model.

Implications for Research and Practice

Although these conclusions are useful as a preliminary step towards understanding the match between verbal interactional patterns and models of discussion, care must be taken not to gloss over important contextual features that could have a bearing, in future research, on the broad conclusions reached above. A number of cautions must be kept in mind. First, the practice of coding teacher utterances as questions or statements without reference to other contextual features may be misleading at times. Such coding is based on the assumption that statements are more conciliatory than questions. However, both statements and questions can be either conciliatory or demanding depending on the context. Reflective statements may be conciliatory and encourage response in some contexts but this effect could be negated by paralinguistic features such as an angry tone of

voice. Further, some statements such as negative evaluative statements may more typically inhibit than encourage response. Conversely, although questions may be demanding, they can also be modulated so as to appear conciliatory - by being indirect, for example. In addition, both questions and statements that are based on prior student contributions may seem more conciliatory than those that are not. Examination of context is necessary to try to determine some of these features.

Second, the practice of coding questions as either lower level or higher level is in need of examination. A number of problems persist: Questions may ask a lower level question explicitly, for example, and a higher level question implicitly simultaneously. Either/or coding schemes do not account for such occurrances. Neither do they address whether the lower or higher level question is addressing a topic of central or peripheral importance. Neither do they address whether the higher level question is concerned with integrating difficult academic concepts or whether it is on the level of asking what flavour of ice cream a student prefers. In addition, the problem of correspondence between level of question and level of response has not been investigated thoroughly enough. What contextual features contribute to the fact that there is only a 50% correspondence between level of question and level of response? Further, it has not been adequately understood that the same content may be addressed by using one higher level question or a series of lower level questions. So who is to say which is better? Similarly, the assumed correspondence between length of student response and its complexity is in need of further examination. It is certainly possible that some lengthy responses can be of recalled information only whereas a simple "yes" or "no" can

require complex thought.

Another coding problem that needs to be addressed is the problem of reification. Methods of coding create preferred ways of seeing. Hence, certain important features in exchanges may go unnoticed. This problem became apparent in the analysis of teacher SN's lesson where a new coding scheme was required, one that stressed the importance of the students' contributrions. One should always be prepared for these problems of reification and ready to alter or devise new coding schemes if the methods utilized seem to be inhibiting insight.

Finally, there is a danger in assuming that the use of a certain strategy will have a similar effect in all contexts. In these lessons, for example, both teacher HK and teacher WB made use of a strategy of repeating and refocusing questions in one teacher turn at talk but there were important qualitative differences in how this strategy was implemented and its results. In teacher HK's utterance, where there was no relation between the teacher's question and prior student turn the student response was inadequate whereas in WB's turn, no right or wrong answer was being elicited, simply a statement of opinion, and the student elaboration was more extensive.

At this stage, research must be descriptive rather then prescriptive. We do not know enough as yet about teachers' verbal interactional patterns to be able to state with any certainty that one form of verbal interaction in the classroom is better than another. There are pros and cons to everything including verbal interactional patterns and models of discussion. While some might deplore course-covering in tight question/answer sequences, finding it boring and uninstructive, others might find it useful, perhaps as a means of maintaining order and fulfilling what society seems to expect of

schooling. While some might find uninhibited student expression of feelings a complete waste of time, others might find it beneficial both therapeurically and as an impetus to thought. Perhaps there is a place for all of these things in the life of the classroom, perhaps not. The point is we cannot make these judgments until we have a fuller idea of just what these verbal interactional patterns look like, how they are used and what effects they have.

With regard to the match between models of discussion and teachers' predominant use of verbal interactional patterns and then the match between these and teachers' explicitly stated beliefs, again at this early stage of research, one can only speculate as to whether or not such knowledge might improve teaching practice? Joan Tough (1979) has discovered that focusing on strategies to get teachers to alter their practice is not as effective as getting teachers to focus primarily on what type of cognitive activity they wish the student to engage in and only secondarilly to reflect on verbal strategy. This observation draws attention to the importance of teachers' understanding their conscious beliefs and the relations between the models of discussion they espouse and their preferred verbal interactional patterns.

It may be that teachers are eclectic in their teaching using alternative verbal interactional patterns based on alternative models in different contexts and even within a lesson. Or, it may be that they either alter curricula to suit their preferred verbal interactional patterns or choose to teach subjects that accommodate use of their preferred verbal interactional patterns more easily. It may be that broader sociological features such as task or subject matter or SES, for example, have a very strong influence on predominant use of

one verbal interactional pattern rather than another. Further research is required to answer these questions. Sociolinguistic analysis of classroom discourse provides one useful tool for examining teachers' verbal interactional patterns and provides a solid base from which both teachers and researchers can try to determine the complex relationships among models of discussion, conscious beliefs about discussion, predominant use of certain verbal interactional patterns and ultimately other factors that influence instructional practice as well.

Directions for Future Research

Two suggestions. First, one most fruitful inquiry would be taping and analyzing "ideal" adult and/or classroom discussions, particularly where integrating is occurring - discussions that Roby (1985) would class as either Problematic or Dialectic. At this point, we have a reasonably clear idea of what subject-centered recitation lessons are. In addition, the characteristics of student-centered expressive lessons seem fairly clear. Both problematic and dialectic lessons remain the most intriguing and possibly the most useful to know more about because they try to integrate subject matter with reflection and theory - product with process. These types of discussion promise to be more "educative" than either the predominantly subject centered or the predominantly student centered models. A second useful inquiry would be to try and take a closer look at what Wood and Wood have referred to in their symposium paper as "contingency". Some initial work has been done in this area in a number of different fields including linguistics (e.g., Halliday & Hasan's (1976) notion of cohesion), second language teaching (e.g., Widdowson's (1978) notion of coherence), and artificial intelligence (e.g., Schank's (1977) notion of topic shift) but it

remains a very little understood area. If we can gain some clear picture of what ideal discussion really looks like (Bridges' (1979) work and Francis' (1982) work seems headed in this direction), and of the varieties of ways in which teachers and students can successfully build on one anothers' contributions, we would then have some basis for understanding what both student and teachers need to know to improve discussion in classrooms. It is premature to make value judgments concerning the overall value of one model of discussion over another. What we have, however, is a wonderfully exciting field for inquiry.

References

Austin, J. L. (1962) How to do things with words. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bellack, A. A., Kliebard, H. M., Hyman, R. T. & Smith, F. L. (1966) The language of the classroom. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Bridges, D. (1979) Education, Democracy and Discussion. Windsor, England: NFER.

Ervin-Tripp, S. & Mitchell-Kernan, C. (1977) Child discourse. New York: Academic.

Farrar, M.T. (1981) Defining and Examining Instruction: An Analysis of Discourse in a Literature Lesson. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto.

Farrar, M.T. (1984) Four Models of Discourse Analysis: Assumptions, Strengths and Limitations. Paper Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April.

Frake, c. Plying frames can be dangerous: An assessment of methodology in cognitive anthropology. (1974) Paper presented at the Conference on Methods in Cognitive Anthropology, Durham, N.C., April.

Francis, E. (1982) Learning to Discuss. Edinburgh, Scotland: Moray

House College of Education, Holyrood Road.

Goffman, E. (1959) The presentation of self in everyday life. New York: Anchor.

Good, C.V. (1983) Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Green, J. L. (1982) Research on teaching as a linguistic process: A state of the art. In Review of Education 10 (A publication of the American Educational Research Association) Itaska, Ill.: Peacock Publishing.

Green, L. L. & Wallat, C. (1981) Ethnography and language in educational settings. Norwood, N. J.: Ablex.

Grice, H.P. (1975) Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J.L. Morgan (Eds.) Syntax and Semantics (Vol.3) Speech Acts. New York: Academic.

Griffin, M. & Humphrey, F. (1978) Task and Talk. In R. Shuy & M. Griffin (Eds.) The Study of Children's Functional Language in the Early Years. (Final report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York.) Arlington, Va: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1961) Categories of a theory of grammar. Word, 17, 241-292.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976) Cohesion in English. (English

language series no.9) London: Longman Group.

Hymes, D. (1972) On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.) Sociolinguistics. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.

Mehan, H. (1979) Learning lessons. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Ostman, J. (1981) You Know: A discourse-functional approach Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V.

Roby, T. (1985) Commonplaces, questions and models of discussion. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April.

Sacks, H. (1967) Unpublished lecture notes.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E.A. & Jefferson, G. (1974) A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turn-Taking for Conversation. Language, 50, 696-735.

Schank, R. (1977) Rules and topics in conversation. Cognitive Science, 1, 421-441.

Searle, J.R. (1969) Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J.R. (1975) Indirect Speech Acts. In P. Cole & J.L. Morgan

(Eds.) Syntax and Semantics (Vol.3) Speech Acts. New York: Academic.

Sinclair, M. McH. & Coulthard, R.M. (1975) Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils. London: Oxford University Press.

Tough, J. (1979) Talking for teaching and learning. London: Ward Lock.

Widdowson, H.G. (1978) Teaching language as communication. London: Oxford.

Wilkinson, L. C. (1982) Communicating in the classroom. New York: Academic.

Wittgenstein, L. (1968) Philosophical investigations (G. E. M. Anscombe trans.) New York: Macmillan. (orig. publ. 1958).